

REMARKS

Reconsideration of and timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11 and 12 are pending active examination. Claims 13-31 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions. Claim 1 is amended to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter. No new claims have been added and no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, and 12 for lack of written description support under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶1. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0005252 of Masuda et al. (Masuda hereinafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,647,953 of Williams et al. (Williams hereinafter), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,522,932 of Wong et al. (Wong hereinafter), and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view of Williams and Wong, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,605,637 of Shan et al. (Shan hereinafter). The applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections and, therefore, respectfully traverse them all, for the reasons presented below.

Turning now to the merits, regarding rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, and 12 for lack of written description support under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶1, the applicants have amended claim 1 by removing the limitation “wherein the chemistries of the first and second plasmas are substantially the same” cited by the Examiner as the basis for the rejection. The applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 under U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view of Williams and further in view of Wong, the applicants respectfully submit that **none of the cited references teach or suggest the use of a “second plasma in a second plasma processing chamber different from said first plasma processing chamber”**, to perform the coating of a plasma chamber component.

Specifically, Masuda teaches the processing of a substrate in a plasma processing system, and discusses the plasma polymerization mechanism by which deposits are formed on the chamber walls during production plasma processing of substrates, and the benefits thereof. As the Examiner correctly noted, Masuda does not teach a preseasoning process to coat chamber components exposed to the plasma in advance of actual production plasma processing of substrates. Williams teaches an **in-situ preseasoning process**, whereby a coating is formed on components exposed to the plasma **inside the same chamber (i.e. “first chamber”) that will be used to perform actual substrate processing**. As the Examiner further correctly noted, neither Masuda nor Williams teach the use of a second plasma in a second plasma processing chamber different than the first plasma processing chamber to perform the coating process.

The Examiner states that the Wong reference provides sufficient teachings to overcome the deficiencies of the Masuda and Williams references, and establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The applicants respectfully disagree that the Examiner has established a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because as stated in MPEP §2143.03,

“[t]o establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.”

In this case, the Masuda, Williams, and Wong references, considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the use of a “second plasma in a second plasma processing chamber different from said first plasma processing chamber” to coat a chamber component in a preseasoning process.

Wong teaches the use of a precoated part (a fastener), coated with a Rhodium film using an electroplating process, and further notes in column 4 lines 31-43 that an electroplating process is the preferred method of coating chamber parts. Nowhere does Wong discuss the coating of components using a “second plasma process in a second plasma processing chamber different from said first plasma processing chamber”, or indeed using *any* plasma process performed *anywhere*. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the Wong

reference does not create a rationale for modifying the Masuda and Williams references by coating a component using “a second plasma in a second plasma processing chamber different than the first plasma processing chamber”, i.e. in exactly the same manner as in the claimed invention. The Examiner’s assertion that the Wong reference does provide the necessary suggestion and motivation to modify the Masuda and Williams reference, stating that there is “a reasonable expectation of success, because both references teach performing a pre-coating process on apparatus parts that have surfaces exposed to plasma during processing to prevent corrosion”, implicates impermissible use of hindsight vision provided by the present disclosure. As stated in MPEP §2141,

“references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention.”

Because Masuda, Williams, and Wong, taken in combination, fail to teach all the elements of claim 1 and, further, because the combination of Masuda, Williams, and Wong is not even proper because it represents a combination formed from impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view of Williams and Wong, be withdrawn.

Regarding rejections of dependent claims 2, 5-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view of Williams and further in view of Wong, and dependent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view Williams, and further in view of Wong and Shan, the applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of being dependent (directly or indirectly) on patentable independent claim 1. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw rejections of claims 2, 5-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view of Williams and further in view of Wong, and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masuda in view Williams, and further in view of Wong and Shan.

Consequently, in view of the present amendments and abovementioned remarks, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present

Application No. 10/766,474
Response dated May 21, 2008
to Office Action mailed November 23, 2007

application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

The applicants are of the opinion that provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) apply to this proceeding, and that a three-month extension of time is due with the filing of this response. The applicants hereby petition for a three-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), with the appropriate fee payment shown on the attached Electronic Fee Sheet.

Due to the finality of the present Office Action, the applicants are also submitting a Request for Continued Examination, under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 with this amendment, along with a fee required by 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) also shown on the attached Electronic Fee Sheet.

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-3451 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Should the Examiner have any questions or deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

TOKYO ELECTRON U.S. HOLDINGS, INC.

By: /Eric J. Strang/
Eric J. Strang, Reg. No. 54,472

4350 W. Chandler Blvd, Suite 10
Chandler, AZ 85226
(480) 539-2109 (voice)
(480) 539-2100 (facsimile)